



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/551,086	09/27/2005	Scott Allan Kendall	PU030096	4375
24498	7550	09/04/2008	EXAMINER	
Joseph J. Laks			ANDRAMUNO, FRANKLIN S	
Thomson Licensing LLC			ART UNIT	
2 Independence Way, Patent Operations			PAPER NUMBER	
PO Box 5312			2623	
PRINCETON, NJ 08543			MAIL DATE	
			DELIVERY MODE	
			09/04/2008	
			PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/551,086

Applicant(s)

KENDALL ET AL.

Examiner

FRANKLIN S. ANDRAMUNO

Art Unit

2623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 May 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 05/14/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues in page 5, "Manson and Naidoo, alone or in combination, fail to disclose detecting a first condition wherein signal strength on a selected channel associated with said emergency alert function exceeds a threshold. Examiner does not agree. Naidoo discloses in (**column 14 lines 3-28**) generally, most life safety devices are configured to automatically detect the presence of a specific type of emergency situation. Upon detection of an emergency condition, the life safety device (32) transmits a signal to the emergency response device (54) in a manner similar to that used when either the wireless emergency notification device (56) or the wired emergency notification device (57) is actuated. In addition, the emergency response device (54) may also notify the emergency response provider station (18) that the call is being established in response to a detection of emergency condition y by the life safety device (32). Naidoo shows how an emergency alert system is capable of receiving/detecting a signal and act upon an emergency using control signals. Moreover, it should be pointed out that a threshold in the current invention is broad enough to read on the detection of the signal in an emergency. The threshold symbolizing the on/off state, sending or holding the emergency unit, signal or no signal received at the detector.
3. In addition, applicant argues in page 6, "figure 4 does not, however, describe receipt of an EAM by the television signal receiving apparatus." Examiner does not

agree. Naidoo discloses in (**column 14 lines 25-28**) the monitoring personnel located at the emergency response provider station (18) would be better equipped to evaluate the situation at the patient station. This shows how the signal received at the monitoring personnel unit can be used for later retrieval in a television signal warning. Moreover, Manson describes an emergency alert system which as shown in (**figure 2**) includes a communication of emergency response using a tv (256).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-3, 8-10, and 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Manson et al (US 6,543,051 B1) in view of Naidoo et al (US 7,185,282 B1). Hereinafter referred a Manson, and Naidoo.

Regarding claims 1, 8 and 15, Manson discloses an apparatus, television signal receiver and the method for controlling an apparatus having an emergency alert function (**Receive Emergency Alert Message (402) in figure 4**), comprising steps of: detecting a second condition wherein a broadcast test associated with said emergency alert function is passed (**figure 4**). **However, Mason fails to teach the use of** detecting a first condition wherein signal strength on a selected channel associated with said emergency alert function exceeds a threshold. This is shown by Naidoo (**column 8**

lines 10-13), said broadcast test including detecting reception of a test signal that is broadcast on a scheduled periodic basis; and providing an output if said first and second conditions are detected (**column 15 lines 2-7**).

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to include the use of a condition detection in an emergency alert function. This is a useful combination because the system will detect emergencies automatically.

Regarding claims 2, 9 and 16, Manson discloses an apparatus, television signal receiver and the method of claim 1, wherein said broadcast test includes determining whether said test signal includes a user selected location code (**column 5 lines 27-29**) associated with said emergency alert function (**Figure 4**).

Regarding claims 3, 10 and 17, Manson discloses an apparatus, television signal receiver and the method of claim 1, wherein said test signal is broadcast on a weekly basis (**Column 7 line 37**).

3. Claims 4-7, 11-14, and 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Manson et al (US 6,543,051 B1) in view of Naidoo et al (US 7,185,282 B1) in view of Ganzer et al (US 5,121,430). Hereinafter referred a Manson, Naidoo, and Ganzer.

Regarding claims 4, 11 and 18, Manson discloses an apparatus, television signal receiver and the method of claim 1, further comprised of: identifying one of said channels having higher signal strength relative to said other channels as said selected

channel **(figure 2)**. However, **Manson fails to teach the** tuning a plurality of channels associated with said emergency alert function. Ganzer discloses on **(column 2 lines 35-40)** a tuner circuitry tuned to the channel number of the station providing service.

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to include the use of a tuner. This is a useful combination because the emergency unit is delivered along the signal with the highest strength.

Regarding claims 5, 12 and 19, Manson discloses an apparatus, television signal receiver and the method of claim 4, further comprised of using said selected channel to receive emergency alert signals capable of activating said emergency alert function **(Create Digital Emergency Alert Message (412) in figure 4)**.

Regarding claims 6, 13 and 20, Naidoo discloses an apparatus, television signal receiver and the method of claim 1, further comprised of: providing a first output message if said first condition is not detected **(column 14 lines 12-18)**; and providing a second output message if said second condition is not detected **(column 15 lines 2-7)**. Regarding claims 7, 14 and 21, Manson discloses an apparatus, television signal receiver and the method of claim 6, wherein said first and second output messages each indicates a corrective action **(Figure 4)**.

Conclusion

2. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to FRANKLIN S. ANDRAMUNO whose telephone number is (571)270-3004. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs (7:30am - 5:00pm) alternate Fri off (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chris Kelley can be reached on (571)272-7331. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Chris Kelley/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 2623